

COMMITTEE ON THE IMPACT OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND THE COURTS

Meeting Minutes

May 13, 2002, 10:00 AM - 2:00 PM
State Courts Building
1st Floor, Conference Room 119 A & B
Phoenix, AZ

CIDVC Members Present

Hon. Karen O'Connor, Chair
Hon. Chris Wotruba, Vice Chair
Hon. George Anagnost
Martha Fraser Harmon
Hon. Dana Hendrix
Bob James
Hon. Ronald Karp
Sheri Lauritano
Robert M. Lehner
Denise Lundin
Hon. Mary Helen Maley*
Hon. Mark Moran
John Pombier
Tracey Wilkinson

Members RSVP (unable to attend)

Margaret Bentzen
Jerry Bernstein
Dr. Teresa Lanier

Staff Present

Janet Scheiderer, CSD Director, AOC
Karen Kretschman, FLU Manager, AOC
Pam Peet, ITD, AOC
Sandeep Menden, ITD, AOC
Tony Shanks, ITD, AOC
Catherine Drezak, Committee Staff

Hallie Bonger-White
Donna Irwin

Members not Present

Hon. Sherry Geisler
Patricia Klahr
Dr. Anu Partap
Dee Wheeler-Cronin

Guests

Allie Bones, ACADV
Dianne Post, ACADV

Presenters

Karl Heckart, ITD Director, AOC
David Berg, IBM Consultant
Martha Anderson, Court Assistance Unit, CSD
Nancy Phegley Court Assistance Unit, CSD

* Attended by telephone

Quorum: No (Note: Due to members arriving late or leaving early a quorum was not reached.)

Call Meeting to Order Bob James

The meeting was called to order at 10:20 AM. Bob James was asked by the Chair to lead the meeting until the Vice Chair or she arrived. All those persons present introduced themselves. Guests attending the meeting were welcomed.

Review of Previous Meeting Minutes Bob James

Minutes of the February 14, 2002 meeting were reviewed and no revisions were proposed. Since there was not a quorum present at this time, the vote on the minutes was delayed while awaiting more members to arrive.

Motion: Quorum not present

Action: Minutes will be approved at the June 5, 2002 meeting.

MEETING BUSINESS AGENDA

A. Strategic Planning - Presentations by the Information Technology Division (ITD) and the Court Services Division (CSD)

The two presentations were requested by the Chair with the goal of updating the new members on the Court Protective Order Repository (CPOR) implementation. Bob James introduced the intent of the presentations, which was to assist the committee in their strategic planning process.

David Berg, representing ITD, was the first presenter. He provided a PowerPoint demonstration which included an summary of the CPOR Project, a synopsis objectives and time-lines, overview of the life cycle a protective order (PO) case and an outline of phases for the implementation of the CPOR project in the courts. Problems include: date requirements for entry of an OP; which data elements that are most often missing; gaps in the criminal justice system processes; courts not using the module printed forms causing increased work for the clerks; undisciplined and inconsistent application of business process by the courts; tracking transferred orders; integrating ITD into the forms update procedure; DPS second party verification of PO for entry into NCIC and ownership of the data. Benefits include immediate availability of PO data for enforcement; more reliable information, reduce double handling of the forms by courts; reduce L.E. double entry; eliminate illegible orders; compiling statistics to obtain grants; streamlining the PO process and increasing the number of POs that are accepted by NCIC. June 2001 completed the scoping project for the development of a repository. October 2001 started collecting information from select Arizona Court Automation Project (ACAP) courts. March 2002 completed pilot project between AOC and Department of Public Safety (DPS) which demonstrated that a query from LE to DPS could tap into the CPOR and get a response back to law enforcement. June 2002 is target for getting all courts statewide to send PO data to CPOR. December 2002 is the target time for getting all law enforcement using the CPOR. Need to convince law enforcement that CPOR contains reliable information. Karl Heckart, ITD Director, assisted with answering some of the questions posed by the committee.

Bob James offered to follow up on the illegibility issue within Maricopa County.

The second presentation was given by Martha Anderson and Nancy Phegly, representing CSD. They provided a demonstration of the Domestic Violence (DV) Module for the AZTEC program. While they reviewed the various screens, they also explained reasons for the mandatory and selected non-mandatory data entry fields. Problems include: DV module does not coordinate with calender or docketing system; non-mandatory fields present on the module; title and party information not linked to verify the information; no automatic cross reference of existing cases; default date does not check if service occurs after one year; relationship not linked to type of PO; marriage date not linked to relationship table; petition screen does not print out; attorney field not clear; Brady flag appears on Ex Parte screen; printed order prints abbreviated order. Benefits include: eliminates illegible writing; allows POs to be available statewide; allows statistical reporting; allows LE to get up-to-date information; allows a default for mandatory fields if data is

unknown; automatically fills in data fields previously entered.

Bob James requested that Karl Heckart return to the meeting and provide an estimated time frame when the DV module will update the docketing and calendar programs. Karl stated that it will be included in either the summer release or the end of year release. The committee also asked for a time line for when recommendations from CIDVC can be made for new AZTEC releases. Karl answered that the recommendations need to be received by the end of July to be included in the end of the year release. CIDVC requested statistics on the courts' use of the CPOR. A public policy group is looking at the issue of what is appropriate for release of information and to whom it is released. CIDVC requested a survey of projected AZTEC enhancements be sent to the members for suggested prioritization and input.

Motion:

Action: Informational item

B. Open discussion by committee members to provide input on the possible goals for the committee. The ideas were captured on flip chart and this chart will be sent to all of the CIDVC members to prioritize and include additional suggestions.

Motion:

Action: Discussion was advisory.

Old Business Judge O'Connor

No Old Business items were brought forward.

New Business Judge O'Connor

A. Change DV forms to conform to new legislation

The bill to eliminate the service fees for protective order will require the addition of a check box on the Injunction Against Harassment form. This check box will indicate that the injunction arises out of a dating relationship and removes the fee for service.

Call to the Public Public Attending

None of the public present offered any comment.

Next Meeting June 05, 2002, Conference Room 119 A&B, AOC, Phoenix, AZ

Adjournment Judge O'Connor

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 PM.